

Contents

Page	
258	ENVY AND EQUALITARIANISM <i>The Editor</i>
261	THE DEFENCE OF THE WEST <i>George Taylor</i>
272	THE MYSTERY OF THE CHURCH <i>Francis Fenn, S.J.</i>
277	AFTER THE SYNOD: IV <i>The Editor</i>
288	A BIG HAND FOR JACKSON <i>E. L. Way</i>
294	VIOLENCE AND LIBERAL DEMOCRACY <i>Henry Edwards</i>
304	REVERSE INCOME TAX <i>J. M. Jackson</i>
310	ANY QUESTIONS? <i>William Lawson, S.J.</i>
315	BOOK REVIEWS

If You Change Your Address:
Please let us know two or
three weeks ahead if possible
and please send us both new
and old addresses. Thank you.

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME II

MAY 1970

NUMBER 5

Envy and Equalitarianism

THE EDITOR

ONCE you lose sight of the centre the periphery takes on unwarranted significance. Or, to put it another way, once concentration shifts from the substance that unites, it fixes on the accidental things that devide men from each other. At this point envy enters. In the name of a bogus equalitarianism, sameness is forced on all. No one dare be different, for to be different is to be superior and this, for the equalitarians, is the gravest sin of all. So the top seeks refuge in the bottom. In the century of the common man the only virtue is to be common. Survival is sought in the anonymity of the crowd. Out of it one can hope to rise not on grounds of merit, but only with the approbation of the crowd as some sort of folk hero incarnating folk virtues; the idol of the hour by grace of the mob. These are the new aristocrats, the image boys and girls granted fame and fortune at the top so long as they reflect the mood at the bottom. These are the bright baubles of the crowd. Let them depart from this role, show for one moment a vestige of true leadership (if *per impossible* they were capable of it) and they are done for; fit only for downgrading, to be returned straightway to the anonymity of the mob. The people giveth and the people

taketh away. Blessed be the name of the people. This is England now. From it the best are going—and rightly so—to escape the tawdry mediocrity which envy has enthroned in what is fast becoming England's grey, unpleasant land. If this is the New Jerusalem the politicians can have it. The best are wise to go when they can.

At the back of the envy that plagues our society—its progenitor, so to say—lies the materialism which has cursed this country now for so long a time. England has lost sight of God and, once this happens, men see each other no longer for what they are in substance, the lovely work of his hands; made in God's image because dowered by him with a soul which is his direct creation; more like him, therefore, than any other part of his visible creation; possessed, thereby, of dignity which makes them like each other in the human nature each one shares. Here is the basic equality — of likeness to each other through shared likeness to God—which should draw men close in appreciation, reverence and love. Against it, individual differences —of birth, background and ability—are as nothing, no more than accidental diversifications between those, who find deep and lasting unity in recognition of the dignity which comes to each human being with that likeness to God which is his birthright. Once God goes, dignity goes and with it that basic unity—founded in lasting appreciation of each other's essential worth—which alone can tie in Chesterton's "living tether" the people of this land.

The alternative is the enthronement of mediocrity, the flat ordinariness of a society controlled by faceless little men in the name of that drab nonentity known as "the people". It is a society which lives by constriction of talent and enterprise, of that variety which is known quite rightly as the spice of life. In it all should be the same. None, therefore, should have a chance greater than another; which means that all, in the last analysis, should be made the same as each other, reduced to a lowest common denominator of ordinariness established by little men who claim power to do so only in the name of "the people".

This is the ugly logic of a world without God. A world made in the image of man where all have sameness thrust upon them. The end of envy's road comes quicker than most think — through the dull uniformity of an imposed equalitarianism into the outstretched arms of the Big-Brother State. Nineteen Eighty-Four is only fourteen years away. The thought should make us think.

SOMETHING ROTTEN IN THE STATE OF DENMARK

"I am not one of those who think that the people are never in the wrong. They have been so, frequently and outrageously, both in other countries and in this. But I do say, that in all disputes between them and their rulers, the presumption is at least upon a par in favour of the people. Experience may perhaps justify me in going further. When popular discontents have been very prevalent, it may well be affirmed and supported, that there has been generally something found amiss in the constitution, or in the conduct of the government. The people have no interest in disorder. When they do wrong, it is their error, and not their crime. But with the government part of the state, it is far otherwise. They certainly may act ill by design, as well as by mistake . . . If this presumption in favour of the subjects against the trustees of power be not the more probable, I am sure it is the more comfortable speculation; because it is more easy to change an administration, than to reform a people."

Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents (1770)
— Edmund Burke.

The writer of this article is a retired soldier, who has seen a great deal of action in the service of his country. His interest in this country's defence has not waned since his retirement, as the intelligent reader will notice at once from a first reading of this extremely informative article.

It is published with acknowledgements to Common Cause, an Organisation that works extremely hard to alert this country to the menace that Communism is and the threat it presents to us all. Brigadier Taylor has for long been closely associated with Common Cause.

The Defence of the West

GEORGE TAYLOR

THE occupation of Czechoslovakia by the massive forces of the Red Army was quickly accomplished in August, 1968. This was followed by the steadily tightening grip of the Soviet Government on the whole country. Very recently this reached a stage where seventeen hundred people were arbitrarily arrested. This occurred—and was no doubt meant to occur—when the world was preoccupied with the collapse of Biafra. The British Press certainly paid scant attention to this grim action, which was aimed at destroying any remaining will the Czechs and Slovaks might have to resist their Soviet oppressors.

The resolve of the Kremlin, openly stated, that they will not allow any member of the Warsaw Pact nations to undertake the liberalisation of their countries should give convincing proof to all men of good will in the West of the stark reality of the dangers we face. If this is still not enough, let them look at the news which comes trickling out of Russia

itself. The picture there is of a group of uneasy men at the top who are scared of the thinking of those intellectuals and students who do not agree with the party line and favour the liberalisation of life in the Soviet Union. They are scared, too, of the unrest amongst the masses in the Soviet Union, who still find their standard of living far lower than they think it should be. The men in the Kremlin are frightened men. This makes them doubly dangerous because they have in their hands massive power. Their aims are the same as in 1917, but their strength now is immeasurably greater than ever it was then. It is the implications of this vast strength and the means needed by the West to meet it that we will consider in this article.

History

In 1919 the British Foreign Office produced and circulated its first paper on Communism. After reading it, Winston Churchill commented, "Whatever Communism is not, it certainly is a blue print for the domination of the world." But even he with his immense and clear historical insight was at times apt to relax his guard and overlook the simple but terrible Russian intention. Very fortunately for us all, his moments of aberration were brief.

In the "Fulton" speech just after World War II Churchill sounded the alarm. The truth was that except for the 'atom bomb' the West was stripped almost defenceless through the over-rapid demobilisation of the immense forces of the United States and the British Empire, each of which had played as great a part in the defeat of the Axis powers as had the Russians. The Soviet Republic, however, kept its war-time forces very largely intact, and used them to occupy and hold down large parts of 'Eastern Europe'. The hopes of liberty and a better life were thereby blighted for over one hundred and eighteen million Europeans. It was this knowledge that moved the Belgian Prime Minister, Paul Henry Spaak, to declare: "There is only one power that has emerged from the War having conquered and now remains in other territories, and that power is Russia". In the period

immediately after the war, the blockade of Berlin, the occupation of Czechoslovakia, the pressures being exerted on Turkey, Greece and Iran all caused grave alarm in the West. Two great acts of statesmanship and co-operation saved the situation in a Europe, war-torn and desperately weak both financially and militarily. Financial aid from the U.S.A. and the Marshal Plan primed the pump for an economic recovery, whilst the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty defensive alliance started to ensure the security of Western Europe against a Communist attack. The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) implements an alliance subscribed to by fifteen nations.

NATO's Aims

The alliance of nations which NATO represents was founded with two main purposes:

- (a) To ensure the security of the North Atlantic area in such a way that each member is protected from attack.
- (b) To work for peace by a reduction of tensions.

The alliance is purely defensive and provides for immediate action by all if one of its members is attacked. Over the years an integrated defence system has been built up and practised by large-scale "exercises" in the various commands.

An Economical System

By sharing between the fifteen nations in NATO the cost of the various types of fixed installations, (termed infrastructure), which are essential for the support of armed forces, there has been built up, without undue or wasteful expenditure, a complex of airfields, signal telecommunications, military headquarters, fuel pipelines and storage depots, radar early warning and navigational aid stations, and naval port installations. The cost of this infrastructure in a typical year is shared thus: U.S.A. 30%, Britain and Germany 11%, while smaller nations pay 5% down to 1% of the total. If the NATO nations tried to provide for their full defensive

requirements on an independent basis, the cost would be at least three times greater. This does not mean that we can be complacent about the present scale of our defensive arrangements.

The Forces of NATO

At the NATO Conference at Lisbon in February, 1952, the participants agreed to provide a force of fifty army divisions, 4,000 aircraft, and strong naval forces for the defence of Western Europe. Those targets, however, have never been achieved, for on second thoughts the European Governments were not prepared to honour the undertaking. They have provided only about half the number of army divisions and 2,800 aircraft. Therefore, instead of being able to meet an invasion from the East with conventional forces, lacking as we did both men and armour, we were forced to rely on the concept of massive retaliation with nuclear weapons, the ground troops merely acting as a thin screen or trip flare to identify the points of attack. Such a dubious situation has lasted for several years, but with the build up of Russian nuclear weapons to a point of near parity with the United States, together with the fact that the NATO forces though not stronger in man-power were much better equipped than in the fifties and especially in "armour" which would enable them to fight and manoeuvre in depth, led the Americans to advocate to NATO a more flexible military policy. It was accepted. We now plan to meet any invasion well forward to the East with conventional forces. Over a short period, ran the argument, NATO forces would be able to hold their own and thus put off for a time a dread decision to use nuclear weapons. Recently, however, the balance of force immediately available has altered to our detriment.

The Balance

Up to August, 1968, the balance of forces in Europe gave the Communists a small advantage, but that has now

been increased by the invading Russian troops in Czechoslovakia, additional to the existing twenty-six crack Russian and East German divisions in East Germany. Furthermore, it is well understood that within a period of thirty days the Russians could reinforce with forty or more divisions from their central reserve inside Russia, and in a matter of a few days from the divisions available in the Ukraine since 1968. This huge force of machines and men could be further reinforced by the numerous divisions of the other Warsaw Pact countries, though we could hope that some of those divisions would be unwilling to fight with zeal and efficiency against the West.

The United States, with a big army in Vietnam and the Atlantic Ocean to cross, could only reinforce NATO in Europe with a few army divisions, but with considerable naval and air help. The French, in spite of their present attitude, would probably reinforce their troops in Germany quickly but their active army is now only a small one and it would take time to mobilise their strong reserves. The British army's strategic reserve is a small one of highly trained and well equipped troops, most being ear-marked to operate on the flanks of the NATO geographical area, in Scandinavia or possibly Greece and Turkey. Already this force has been depleted by commitments to reinforce the garrison in Northern Ireland.

Mr. Healey, the Minister for Defence, has recently stated that in addition to this force we would be able to reinforce the British Army of the Rhine with some sixty-five thousand men on mobilisation. It is difficult to see the number as anything but drafts to bring units up to their "war establishments", or to replace casualties, or to provide the necessary backing of line-of-communication units (non-fighting) for the field army.

Home Defence

The departure of these two forces, the strategic reserve and the newly-mobilised force, will leave Britain almost bare of fighting units, whether 'regular' or 'volunteer'. The emasculation of our Territorial Army of twelve divisions,

often said to have been the finest reserve army in Europe, has left us without a defence organisation of any real substance in our Island home. Thus at the present time we could only provide a very thin, improvised and shaky defence if the Russians were to launch boldly an airborne army against the United Kingdom, backed perhaps by an amphibious landing in Scotland mounted from the Kola base, where massive naval and air forces are now concentrated, the whole operation being supported by a strong rocket missile attack with high explosive aimed at our cities. Such an attack could come at the end of the land battle in Europe or even during it. In addition to this we would be wide open to the operations of subversive groups inside Britain, who could foment civil disorder on a large scale, and with foreign help carry out such destructive raids against "pin-point" targets as would bring about a state of chaos in our industrial and military infrastructure, making efforts to prepare our defences either impossible or at least extremely difficult. Any future enemies are unlikely to give us the time that Hitler did to organise our defences. The constant reconnaissance of the approaches and coastal waters of Scotland by Russian maritime forces is a sinister fact and the Royal Navy and the Royal Air Force located in the area are overstretched in watching their activities.

The smashing of the Territorial Army was a most fearful decision for the Government to take and it is only to be hoped that nemesis will not overtake us all for allowing the safety and independence of Britain to be put in jeopardy by this act of gross neglect: We are now the only nation in the West with no form of Home Guard — and for that matter Territorials — available for home defence — since what remains of the latter is now tailored to support our Army in Germany. How different was the action of the greatest Englishman of this century, Winston Churchill, who in 1952, at a time when the West had a monopoly of the "atom bomb", thought it necessary to call for volunteers to form cadres of "Home Guards" in preparation as he put it, "for a hedgehog defence of these islands".

The wasting away of the Navy's aircraft carriers and the general lack of escort ships in the Royal Navy and in the other NATO navies, too, is equally disturbing. This is especially so, for in the last decade the tonnage of exports and imports carried at sea to sustain the life of our nation has greatly increased. The threat from the vast and growing Russian submarine fleet is a grave one. Twice in this century we have been within a few weeks of being starved into surrender, well illustrated by Winston Churchill's remark after World War II, "The only thing that really worried me was the U-boat war".

The Royal Air Force, though still of very high quality, has been cut to the bone, and the reserve of an auxiliary Air Force no longer exists. The standing down of our "Civil Defence" organisation, combined with the mutilation of our sound system of volunteer reserve forces on top of the decision taken ten years ago to abolish "National Service" means that the nation has been deprived of the essential framework on which our people could rally with all their native courage on the sudden threat of war. The very lack of such a basic system of defence has greatly increased the danger of war breaking out in Europe in the near future.

In the course of Britain's history we have generally possessed a good system of defensive reserve strength that, given time under the protection of the Royal Navy and the Royal Air Force, could be expanded and trained to suit our strategic purpose. Now at a time when large bodies of men and their weapons can be moved more quickly by air than ever before, and when we can no longer be certain of controlling the seas round our coasts, we choose to abolish the defence system that has guarded our home base so well in the past.

A False Appreciation

The decision to cut our conventional forces is based on a fallacy: the belief that we can deter an attack by the threat to use nuclear weapons. It is the writer's strong belief that such terrible weapons will not be used against a Russian conventional attack because to do so would be an act of despair;

just as non-rational as that of a man's suicide. It is difficult to see a British Cabinet decision to use nuclear weapons or a NATO joint one to the same purpose, because the United States would not permit them to be used, even if the other nations were in agreement. Thus, though it is vital to have such powerful weapons to prevent the West being blackmailed into surrender by an enemy threat to use them, to over-depend on nuclear weapons is just as much an illusion as the over-dependence of the French on the Maginot line in 1940, or ourselves on the Singapore naval base in 1941. History in recent years supports this belief. Since 1945 we have had a continuous series of wars, including the two big ones of Korea and the continuing struggle in Vietnam. In the two named conflicts hundreds of thousands of men fought and in one case are still fighting and are supported by strong air forces and navies, but atom weapons have not been used.

A Way Must be Found

It has been calculated that if NATO countries made as big an effort to defend themselves as do the two neutral nations, Sweden and Switzerland, the astonishing figure of one thousand army divisions would be available for the defence of Western and Central Europe. Sweden and Switzerland provide themselves with a strong defensive system without any great economic strain. Certainly one of the chief reasons why Switzerland is able to do this is because of the Swiss Militia system which provides a well-trained, part-time, army that would be very dependable in defence. The present writer in service "war games" realised how valuable a type of Swiss Militia or territorial/Home Guard force would be to cover and hold terrain in Europe where it would not be sound to commit regular formations — which should be used in a mobile hard-hitting role.

A NATO decision to provide these auxiliary forces would have, also, the great advantage of making it very difficult for the Russians to make propaganda capital out of their formation. It would be very obvious that they would not be used

in an offensive strategic capacity. Their role would be defensive only.

Warnings

We have had a number of warnings of Russian aggressive intentions: the blockade of Berlin and the present pressures on the life of that city, the ruthless crushing of the Hungarian revolt, the dangerous gamble of the attempt to establish nuclear weapons in Cuba, and the immense flow of war material to support the Communists in Vietnam, without which that war would have been finished long ago. At this moment Russians are astride Central Europe with a vast army and air force mobilised for war on land, and with strong naval forces at sea. Already the world is beginning to forget that in Czechoslovakia a people yearning to be free is held down by brute force — soon the stark crime of August 1968 will be overlaid by other events. It has been rightly said that wishful thinking is the great temptation of democratic politicians. Let ours not ignore the warnings of the intelligence staffs. We depend on the leadership of our Parliamentarians and unless they are vigilant and well-informed and put Britain before "Party" we shall have a 'defensive' system that is no defence; which is the present situation. Every possibility cannot be covered, but a flexible system capable of rapid expansion and even improvisation is the one that we should emphasise. War is the media of the unexpected, and it is only by not being rigid in our arrangements that we shall avoid surprise over the form that the next war will take when it does come. As surely it will, unless there is an immense change of heart in the Communist world, and a better understanding in the West of the need to be abundantly prepared at all times to withstand the Communist aim to dominate the world.

For Britain, this means a true territorial home defence, whether regular or part-time, so that the nation may never lie at the mercy of an invader and its own subversive elements which recognise allegiance solely to international Marxism and Communist powers.

APPENDIX

Comparison of Forces in Europe

Forces	Northern Europe			Southern Europe		
	NATO	Russian	Warsaw Pact	NATO	Russian	Warsaw Pact
Army Brigades						
Armoured Brigades	24	44	77	15	15	30
Infantry	45	50	100	55	42	80
Mechanised/ Airborne	27	55	96	18	18	42
After Mobilisa- tion of first line reserves.	55	72	150	80	46	90
Group Troops	450,000	330,000	400,000	425	390,000	200,000
Tanks: Now	4,800	6,000	11,000	1,600	1,100	4,300
Tanks: Mobilisa- tion	6,100	6,750	14,600	1,800	5,500	5,500

Notes: Strengths of infantry brigades in NATO forces vary in the different armies but an average figure would be about 4,000 men. An Armoured Brigade has less men, the average strength in Tanks would be about 150. Warsaw Pact Brigades are 40% smaller in man-power than those of NATO but the difference in fire-power is narrower than this. The NATO deficiency in Tanks is made up for to a limited extent by a superiority in anti-tank weapons. It is estimated that after a period of about thirty days the Communists in Northern Europe could bring to bear a superiority in machines and men of 3 to 1 by reinforcing from their central reserve in Russia.

	Northern Europe			Southern Europe		
	NATO	Russian	Warsaw Pact	NATO	Russian	Warsaw Pact
Tactical Air Forces						
Light Bombers	50	400	450		200	200
Fighters and Ground Attack	1,500	1,120	1,650	540	740	980
Interceptors	720	2,000	3,000	280	1,000	1,360
Reconnaissance	530	200	280	130	160	210

Notes: NATO Air Forces though considerably smaller than the Communist Air Forces have probably a higher all round capability in range, weapon load, loiter time over target and better crew training.

Sea Power World Basis

	U.S.A.	Britain	France	China	Russia
Aircraft Carriers	23	3	3		
Heliocraft Carriers	160				1
Commando Carriers	160	2			1
Assault Ships		2			
Guided Missile Cruisers	12	6	3		7
Gun Cruisers	2		2		12
Large Missile	55	6			178
Destroyers and Frigates					
Ocean going Escort ships	267	66	44	10	38
Nuclear Missile Subs.	41	1			38
Other Missile Subs. Non-Nuclear					50
Nuclear Powered Hunter Subs.	35	2			12
Other Submarines	78	30	19	32	300

Missile Weapons and Bombing Aircraft

Missiles	U.S.A.	Britain	France	China	Russia
Land Based ICBM's	1050				1000
Fleet Ballistic Missiles	656	4 Polaris by end of 1970			125
Medium Range N.M.'s					750 (E) (E) Target on Europe
Long Range Heavy Bombers	500				150
Medium Bombers	40	75	30	10	

NOTE: Appendix is with acknowledgments to Strategic Study Centre.

CHRISTIAN ORDER, MAY, 1970

What do we mean by the Church? Is it only a matter of personal conviction, known and judged by God alone? If so must it not have an object? And should we not be much more specific?

The Mystery of the Church

FRANCIS FENN, S.J.

"CATHOLICS, Anglicans, Methodists, Baptists all profess a common faith in one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church."

"Maybe they all say the same thing, but they don't all mean the same thing. So you can hardly call it professing a common faith."

"Who is to know, except God, what people mean, or ought to mean, by the Church? This is a matter of personal conviction, which can only be judged in the terms of some accepted formula. If they will accept the formula, well and good."

This is the substance of a conversation that took place recently between two of those strange people called ecumenists, both of them Catholics. I think it raises some important issues which I ought to try to clear up, though it may take more than one article to do it.

Of course belief in the Church, or in God and Jesus Christ, is "a matter of personal conviction". It is a matter of faith, itself a gift of the Holy Spirit. But faith must have an object: basically this is a Person, namely Jesus Christ who is the revelation of God. We do not found our hope on a set of propositions: the articles of the Creed are secondary to our faith in Christ. We believe the Catholic faith (summed up in the Creeds) because it represents to us the mind of Christ about the mystery of salvation.

In the Creed we say at Mass on Sundays, the part about the Church comes in the third of the Creed's three main sections — on the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. By now, these words are probably familiar to you:

"All life, all holiness comes from you through your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, by the working of the Holy Spirit. From age to age you gather a people to yourself, so that from east to west a perfect offering may be made to the glory of your name".⁽¹⁾

But we have to be more specific. We have to ask the question "Where is this people which the Holy Spirit gathers?" Notice, in passing, that it is not a question of like-minded people getting together, as in some secular society. Nor is it like the secular State into which we were born, and to which we cannot help belonging. We are Christians because we freely choose, by faith, to be so. (This should be very clear in these days, when religion is no longer a social convention.) If, by the mercy of God, we are "made Christians" as infants in baptism, this of its very nature looks forward to a personal response of faith which, of course, we are free to refuse. So we can gain nothing by trying to compare the Church (wherever it is) to secular society, talking of "democracy" or "monarchy" and applying these terms to the Church. I read an article recently which tried to make out that because God is a monarch (a title I should have thought would be more appropriate on Muslim lips) therefore the Church is a monarchy—which I hope to show it is not. Nor is it a democracy, though this passage from the Vatican Council's Constitution on the Church is notable:

"If by the will of Christ some are made teachers, dispensers of mysteries, and shepherds on behalf of others, yet all share a true equality with regard to the dignity and to the activity common to all the faithful . . . For the distinction which the Lord made between sacred ministers and the rest of the People of God entails a unifying purpose, since pastors and the other

faithful are bound to each other by a mutual need.”⁽²⁾ Pope, bishops and priests are among “the faithful” — a term which is often misused for “laity”.

But back to our question: Where is this People of God, the Church? In the conversation at the beginning of this article, one of the speakers said: “Who is to know, except God, what people ought to mean by the Church?” If this means, for example, what ought a Baptist to mean by “the Church”, then clearly he can only follow the light that is given him. But if the speaker meant that there are no objective standards by which to judge the whereabouts of the Church — which really means that there is no visible society of people properly called by this name, then I fear he was not speaking as a Catholic.

“Whosoever, knowing that the Catholic Church was made necessary by God through Jesus Christ, would refuse to enter her or to remain in her could not be saved. They are fully incorporated into the society of the Church who, possessing the Spirit of Christ, accept her entire system and all the means of salvation given to her, and through union with her visible structure are joined to Christ, who rules her through the Supreme Pontiff and the bishops.”⁽³⁾

The Council makes it clear that only Catholic Christians are fully incorporated into the Church: but not all Catholics, even, are fully incorporated. It is not enough to be externally a Catholic; one must also be animated by the Spirit of Christ. And if there are degrees of “incorporation” into the Church, what of those who possess the Spirit of Christ and, through no fault of their own, are “outside the visible boundaries of the Catholic Church”?⁽⁴⁾

It will help us here if we go back to the beginning of this incorporation, which is baptism; though, in the case of an adult, faith will precede baptism in point of time. “By the sacrament of baptism”, says the Council, “a man becomes

(2) art. 32 (3) *ibid.*, art. 14.

(4) cf. *Decree on Ecumenism*, art. 3.

truly incorporated into the crucified and gloried Christ".⁽⁵⁾ Is this incorporation different in extent to incorporation into the Church, so that one could say that a person was "in Christ" and not in the Church?

By no means. For St. Paul, to whom we owe the roots of our theology in this matter, to be baptised into the Church is to be baptised into Christ. The Church is the sacrament of Christ, his earthly body. "I am Jesus, and you are persecuting me", said the voice to Saul on the road to Damascus. "You know, surely" (writes Paul to the Corinthians) "that your bodies are members making up the body of Christ".⁽⁶⁾

This is why I have headed this article "The Mystery of the Church" (which is the heading also of the first chapter of the Council's Constitution on the Church). One falls into a great deal of trouble if one tries to separate the outward form of the Church from its inner reality. I propose here to develop this idea a little, and to leave its ecumenical implications for a further article.

In heaven, Christ as Man represents the human race for whom he laid down his life. But he is at the same time Head of redeemed humanity. When this mystery is made visible on earth, it is the Church that represents redeemed humanity: "I urge that supplications . . . be made for all men".⁽⁷⁾

And the Headship of Christ is made visible in the Church by the hierarchy of Pope and bishops:

"The power of binding and loosing which was given to Peter was granted also to the college of apostles, joined with their head. This college, insofar as it is composed of many, expresses the variety and universality of the People of God; but insofar as it is assembled under one head, it expresses the unity of the flock of Christ."⁽⁸⁾

In even the smallest community of the faithful assembled

(5) *ibid.*, art. 22. (6) *Acts* 9,5; *I Cor.* 6,15 (Jerusalem Bible)

(7) *I Timothy* 2,1.

(8) *Constitution on the Church*, art. 22.

around an altar, in union with their bishop and presided over by their priest, "the one holy, catholic and apostolic Church gathers together".⁽⁹⁾ Priests, associated with their bishop, "make the universal Church visible in their own locality".⁽¹⁰⁾ This comes about by the preaching of the Gospel of Christ and the celebration of the Lord's Supper, for

"Because there is one Bread, we who are many are one Body, for we all partake of the one Bread".⁽¹¹⁾

Whether we are thinking of individuals in a local congregation, local congregations in a diocese, or dioceses in the whole Church, "the partaking of the Body of Christ transforms us into that which we consume"⁽¹²⁾ or, as an ancient prayer has it, "that by the flesh and blood of the Lord's body the whole brotherhood may be bound together" in unity of faith and life.

"It is through the faithful preaching of the gospel by the apostles and their successors — the bishops with Peter's successors at their head — through their administration of the sacraments, and through their loving exercise of authority, that Jesus Christ wishes his people to increase under the influence of the Holy Spirit. Thereby, too, he perfects his people's fellowship in unity; in the confession of one faith, in the common celebration of divine worship, and in the fraternal harmony of the family of God . . . This is the sacred mystery of the unity of the Church . . . and the source of this mystery is the unity, in the Trinity of Persons, of one God, the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit."⁽¹³⁾

(9) *ibid.*, art. 26. (10) *ibid.*, art. 28. (11) *I Corinthians* 10,17.

(12) St Leo the Great. (13) *Decree on Ecumenism*, art. 2.

CURRENT COMMENT

The action of the Church on contemporary society must be in aid of human dignity. This means Christian influence on the socio-political order. In modern times there has been practically none. In this article, Father Crane examines the reasons for this and suggests the remedies he considers appropriate. He sees the Catholic school as the key recovery-point, the starting-place from which true aggiornamento must begin. He is not surprised that many Progressives within the Church should choose this moment to call for its abolition.

After The Synod

Reflections on the Church and Contemporary Society : IV.

THE EDITOR

THE social action of the Church — her action on contemporary society — must be in aid of human dignity. We reached this conclusion last month. What it means is that society should be permeated with the values of Christ, which are not confined to Catholics, but meant to influence the lives of all men of good will. What we have to do now is to inquire into this process of permeation.

Permeation not yet Begun

A beginning might best be made with the thought that, as yet, it has not been effectively begun. I am thinking here of modern times, which might be defined, for purposes of

this article, as running from the French Revolution until our own day. As an example, one might take this country and reflect that, since the restoration of the Hierarchy more than one hundred and twenty years ago, the number of converts to Catholicism has increased, whilst the moral tone of the country has progressively declined. The story has repeated itself more or less everywhere else in the West and is being retold now everywhere throughout the developing countries. The Church has been and is without significant influence on contemporary society, which remains not merely unpenetrated, but untouched in many ways by Christian values. One has to account for this failure in order to discover what needs to be restored so that the process of permeation may be begun.

Survival and Influence

Part of the answer has already been given in a previous article where it was shown how the Church was driven to concentrate almost solely on survival in face of pressure put on her over the years by national secular States. Inevitably, almost, at national level, she came to acquiesce in the junior position assigned her by secularist power; and she tended to hold to it, as she does now, when the pressures responsible for its original imposition were on the decline. Her attitude remained and tends to remain now one of contented self-containment; inward-turning and concentrating on her own preservation as an enclave within a larger society over which she neither has nor is meant to have any significant influence. It was, of course, inevitable that this attitude should be taken by her missionaries to the developing countries, to reveal itself so strongly in these latter days of over sensitive, post-independence nationalisms. It has been remarked with truth that Africa has been liberated into the nineteenth century. It would be surprising if the Church — in Africa as elsewhere in the developing world — were not inclined to relate itself to surrounding society in nineteenth-century terms. This is, in fact, what has happened.

Doctrinal Stress and Defensive Outlook

It would be surprising also, under the circumstances, if doctrinal stress did not conform to the mental outlook or habit of mind — which in turn promoted and was promoted by the posture of self-containment. A compound mentality produces a compound Church, which in turn reinforces the compound mentality. The process inclines to be cumulative. Self-containment has produced its own brand of what might be called defensive learning within the Church, with concentration on Apologetics and Christian living seen almost wholly in terms of conformity with the injunctions of the institutional Church. The idea was that you held by faith to what you had in the hope of life to come. I do not scorn it. It produced many magnificent Catholics. My only purpose here is to point out that this Catholic society — steadfast and fiercely inward-turning — did not think in terms of influencing surrounding society. It saw itself, you might say, as having much to hold and little to give. It worked by loyalty — if I might put it this way — and not by love. It was without the inclination to give the Faith to others. It was a matter of holding what you had; establishing peaceful co-existence between the Church and the world. This attitude persists. It would be surprising if it did not. Frank Sheed put it well in a lecture of his I was privileged to listen to in the pre-conciliar days. The best of the young Catholic laity, he said were able to defend the divinity of Christ, but they did not understand what it meant to love Him. The attitude is defensive. You cannot give on this basis. The idea is that you should hold what you have. It followed that surrounding society was not touched by the Faith to any extent, not penetrated by its values. More tragically, the Faith, in the persons of a good many individual Catholics, was being overcome by the world. Secular values were penetrating their lives to the point where, in a good many cases, the light of Faith was extinguished.

Young Catholics and the World

I tried to describe this situation some years ago at the

end of the pre-conciliar days. I believe my words are still valid today. This is what I wrote:

"Must one say that appreciation of the true meaning of the Faith is lacking among Catholics, so that there is on their part no inclination to allow it to play a full part in their own lives and, through them, to influence the lives of others and so of society as a whole? Is it courage or appreciation that we lack? I incline to the latter view, if only for the fact that appreciation follows understanding and that courage comes when one understands. I would advance the thesis that many Catholics are without sufficient appreciation of their Faith today, and that is why they lack the inclination to give it to others. It is not permeating their own lives. That is why it does not shine out, through them, on others. They are taught, indeed, to see the Faith as a system to which they should be loyal, but they lack understanding of it as a way of life which alone brings a man his whole hope of human fulfilment. Their assent to the Faith is often notional, not real. They accept it as one accepts the truth that two and two make four; without feeling, or the reference of their lives to its significance. They do not accept it as one accepts for example, the truth of love, not only as defined in the dictionary, but when it has been poured out in one's own regard without constraint. They accept their Faith in what one might call an academic sort of way, without sufficient realisation of its power to transform their capacity for significant living. For many, it is an impersonal something outside themselves to which they adhere, a list of observances that they are meant to and do observe. It goes no deeper than that. For far too many Catholics it is without relevance to life except for its code of 'don'ts' which, subconsciously, they feel makes life rather dull, but which they accept as part of a bargain struck for the security of ultimate salvation. They see themselves as no more, perhaps, than members of the oldest insurance society

in the world. For the rest, their minds are the same as that of the world about them. There is little inclination on their part to pass on to others a loyalty and a moral code which they themselves think of as unattractive, which they observe out of duty and which, in their own eyes, are quite unrelated in any way to the ordinary business of living.

"If this analysis is correct, it would seem legitimate to conclude that Catholics are much more vulnerable than one would at first suspect to the immense but superficial attraction of a materialistic world. It is not merely a question of their failing to influence that world, but of their being caught by it, yielding to it at the expense of their Faith. If the good life for them means no more than loyalty to a remote system, a desperate clinging to a moral code in the midst of a materialist world whose joys they may not touch; if they have been taught that life is no more than a vale of tears, yet remain yearning for happiness which they feel, wrongly, is to be found in terms of materialist surroundings; if their practice of virtue is reluctant because unrelated to the beauty of personal fulfilment; if they have been taught to see little more in their Faith than a contract for salvation; if their general approach to life has been set by well-intentioned yet faulty teaching within this mental framework, then it is not at all unlikely that they will cease to practise their religion and it goes without saying that they will have no influence whatsoever over their environment. Through them the values of Christ will not permeate society, for the simple reason that those same values are not meaningful to them in any significant way. Through them, they cannot, therefore, be made meaningful to others.

"What they want, naturally enough, is happiness. Through faulty teaching they have been led to see it as forbidden fruit, within their grasp, yet incompatible with their religion, which appears to forbid it. Because

they have not understood, they have no vision of true happiness and of its connection with the full living of their Faith, which they have never been taught to see as related in any significant way to the business of living. Under these circumstances, I can understand that in a crisis—when the urge to what they think of as happiness is overpowering and incompatible with religious practice — they should drop their religion. At this point, appeals to them to be loyal are very often useless. Final blame lies with those who have failed to teach them the full meaning of their Faith, who have given them a system and denied them life. So they go. They cease to practise a religion which never had any real meaning for them. The bond has snapped. They are blameworthy to some extent, but it is difficult to see how the whole load of blame can be placed on their shoulders".

Christian Influence is Through Christians

That is what I wrote some years ago. I am sure it is still true today. It contains a simple thought: the Church will not influence society — Christ's values will not permeate the social order — except through Christians or, better, the impact of a true Christian community each of whose members understands the meaningfulness of his religion in terms of life. If the Church is to influence contemporary society her children must first understand what it means to be a Christian. At what point, then, must the Church make a start in bringing to the young an appreciation of their Faith in terms of life?

Begin with the School

I would say, unhesitatingly, that the right sort of start can be made only in the school. It is there that the seed must be sown. Why not in the home? Because the process of reorientation requires a skill and knowledge of religion that no parent today could reasonably be expected to have. Put another way, the gap between the kind of knowledge

of their Faith possessed by the present generation of parents and that required for their children is so great that the parents cannot reasonably be expected to fill it. The transfer is from the somewhat sterile learning of a code of obligations to a positive approach that introduces a child, during his years at school, to a prayerful understanding of the riches of his Faith that will serve him for life. It is a task of immense difficulty and grave responsibility and it would be grossly unfair to expect today's parents to undertake it. But the hope is that tomorrow's will share in it; that the first recipients of re-emphasized religious teaching will be able as parents to co-operate with priest and teacher in the all-important work of giving the Faith to their children in terms of life.

Integrated Catholics

Let us be quite clear as to what this implies so far as Catholic schools are concerned. It means more than the change of emphasis in the teaching of religion in the classroom to which we have just referred. What it calls for is a gearing of *the whole school* to the production of integrated Catholics. After all, the case for Catholic schools rests on the rightful claim that Catholicism is all-pervasive; that religion is caught rather than taught. This means a great deal more than a crucifix in a classroom or the occasional visit of a priest to a catechism class. It means fashioning children not merely for life, but for life in Christ, making him the centre of their living and His Mystical Body, which is the Church, the framework within which they move and have their being. What one has in mind is the whole approach embraced by a liturgy and catechetics that grow in response to a need to form our children that they find their fullness in Christ; going out into the world, therefore, not, as now, with the vague feeling that they are denied much, but in the sure knowledge that, having gained all, they can give it with confidence to others. The world will gain no victory over the Faith of young Catholics formed in this fashion. That is the negative angle. More positively, the world will be penetrated only by the Faith of young

Catholics formed in this fashion. Social action — the action of the Church on contemporary society — is no more — it can be no less — than the spilling over into the concrete of the charity of Christ. Christ's values can permeate society only through the lives of Catholics who are truly in love with Christ. This is the long and the short of it; the basis for any kind of effective effort in the social field.

Teachers Must Change

There are two further points to be made. The first still concerns the school as the place *par excellence* where the essential reorientation in the approach of the young Catholic to his Faith is to be made. The point is a very simple one. There will be no change in the school unless, in the last analysis, teachers themselves are convinced of the need for this change and possessed of the knowledge, patience and self-sacrifice necessary to bring it about. A corresponding obligation is placed, thereby, on teacher training colleges, on seminaries and on religious houses of study. Looking forward from the school to the university, one sees the need for chaplains possessed not only of the knowledge but the personality to build on the process of formation which should have been done at school. Overall, the responsibility on bishops and heads of religious orders everywhere is heavy. If this assessment of mine is correct, it means that the Catholic school is the key to any effective future action of the Church on contemporary society. I would go further and say that true *aggiornamento* starts here, with the Faith of the children; that, without the effort I have called for in the schoolroom, structural and liturgical reforms will come to practically nothing at all. The reason is clear. To be effective they must grow out of a *living Faith*. If that Faith is not living — related in no meaningful way to life — they will be thought of as no more than impositions designed to plague us, ends in themselves, a new set of rules that have to be observed. I cannot see how they can be effective unless built on a living Faith. I cannot see how Faith can be living if regarded as no more than a list

of obligations. The need, then, for reorientation is paramount and the place to begin is the school. As yet we have hardly begun. And it should surprise no one that Catholic Progressives have chosen this moment to advocate the abolition of denominational schools. Nothing illustrates more clearly the nature of their thinking than this kind of advocacy. It is exactly what one would expect of them. And one would expect them to be cheered on in this by young religious anxious to chat up teenagers in coffee bars instead of engaging in the hard and difficult work of teaching the young; clerical "sloppy Joes" whose desire for the "inner city" is in most cases no more than a form of escapism from the exacting demands of active religious life. These should not be listened to. Tragically, they have been in too many cases. Schools have been closed under their pressure and the energies of former teachers dissipated in a variety of ineffective pursuits which no one in his senses would think of as geared to the demands of genuine conciliar reform.

The Parish: Adjunct or Centre of Life?

The second point concerns the parish and I make it with diffidence. It is easy to lay oneself open here to the charge of preaching theoretical extravagance and heaven knows, long-suffering parish priests since the Council have had quite enough of that. Indeed, it must be infuriating for an overworked and devoted parish priest to have an outsider put before him what he thinks of—often with very good reason—as no more than a list of impractical suggestions. After all, he will say, it is his business to administer the sacraments and care for his people. What more should he do? One might ask with great deference, whether it would not make a world of difference if his people saw in his parish the relevance of the sacraments to their daily lives; if they saw his church and theirs as the centre of their living. Is it to be that or an adjunct? This, I think, is the question. For many of the Faithful today it is the latter. It is the place where one goes, with devotion indeed, but

essentially to fulfil an obligation rather than to seek life. This, I think, is the crux of the matter. The picture is not uncommon, in any city of any country today, of an over-worked and devoted priest trying to keep together devoted parishioners who do not fully understand the significance of their Faith; and doing this by measures which prevent him further from doing so. Let me explain.

Overworked in the first place, the priest puts the last ounce of himself into organisations and parish entertainments of one sort and another, which are designed to keep his people, especially the younger ones, together. Thereby, unless he is an absolute genius, he is prevented from finding the time to give to the preparation, for example, of instructions in which he could explain to his people, by word and action, the meaning of the supernatural life that is theirs, the way it is nourished through the sacraments and so on. His people do not understand; and because they do not understand, they drift. Efforts are then made to hold them. Thereby, the priest is robbed of the time which he must have if he is to help them to understand. Under such circumstances will they ever be held? And, even if held, will they ever exercise any real influence on their working environment? Here is the circle. We are back at the original point. If parishioners treat their parish church as an adjunct, because they do not really understand their Faith, does the solution lie in surrounding the Church with semi-secular activities which make it more attractive, or is it to be found in the kind of radical revolution within the parish which, with the help of catechists and liturgy, teaches them the vital significance of their Faith? The efficacy of the former proceeding seems very doubtful. That of the latter seems certain, if slow at first. It rests on the assumption that Catholics today, particularly the younger generation of them, want to come alive and that they will centre their lives on their parish once they see their Faith as a fountain of the more abundant life which is to be found only in Christ.

Long-term and Short-term

As I write these lines, I am thinking of the young Catholic boy or girl caught up in the excitement of the fast-changing contemporary world; and I am wondering rather wistfully what would happen if they went from school not with the feeling that their Faith had deprived them somehow of life, but certain in their knowledge that it had supplied them with its key, determined therefore not to tag along behind the materialistic crowd that too often sets the pace in every country today, but quietly purposeful in their resolution to transform the environment of their working lives. Leadership of this sort—of a Catholic community conscious of the significance of life shared in Christ — remains unknown amongst us today. Its development is essential if Christian values are to permeate society to the extent rendered necessary by respect for human dignity. The task is long-term, which does not mean that we should take a long time getting down to it. We should move in on it at once and take confidence from the fact that it defines the direction of our effort and ensures, thereby, the best use of our resources. At the same time, it should be noticed most carefully that there is another, short-term side to this problem of exercising influence on contemporary society. There is a task to be done not only through the radiance shed on its environment over the years by a truly Christian community but also through the positive efforts of a totally dedicated few who seek actively and directly to bring a Christian influence to bear at the key points of a nation's life. This I call (rather inappropriately, I am afraid) the short-term approach to the problem of exercising influence on contemporary society; short-term in this sense that it can be done at once; the dedicated few can be found and trained to bring a Christian influence to bear at the nerve centres which exist at all levels of a nation's life. This work is essential. The need for it is pressing. It will be considered in a final article.

(To be concluded)

At the moment of writing it seems that a new civil rights leader is emerging in the United States. He believes in an economic 'cold war' against the whites rather than in a 'hot war'; in the boycott of shops where discriminatory practices are in vogue rather than in the smashing of windows.

A Big Hand for Jackson

E. L. WAY

CALLING for 'Four cheers' for a political leader is always a risky business. But a political commentator realises that his neck was given to him not only to support his head, but that every so often he must stick it out. And in some countries the risk is much greater than in others. Many of us, for example, chucking cheap cynicism out of the window had just begun to hope again for the United States, and therefore to hope again for the world when shots rang out in a hotel basement and Robert Kennedy lay dying, murdered by a fanatical Arab. The anguished voice of a young man crying out in that basement: "On no!"; "O no!" echoed painfully in the hearts of many all over the world. But Robert had gone to join his brother and Martin Luther King; and we were left speculating as to why good men of promise should die violently while so many brutes and blackguards who have 'larded it over the gentiles' should die with every comfort in their beds of nothing worse than a rotten old age.

Rev. Jesse L. Jackson

After the murder of Dr. King it looked for a while as if the leadership of the civil rights movement would pass into the hands of men of blood: men convinced that democratic procedures were invented for the protection of

middle-class bank balances, and that essential rights could only be snatched at the point of a gun. To meet this threat there has emerged the 'lawanorda' battalion: men armed with the principles of Chemical Mace, nightsticks and escorted by paddywagons and Daley-dozers (Jeeps with barbed-wire grids in front of their bumpers). Now the Rev. Jesse L. Jackson has stepped forward into this uncivilised no-man's-land with a message, a simple common-sense philosophy and a collection of eminently chantable slogans. He is the leader of Operation Breadbasket, the economic wing of Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Young, tall, persuasive and self-composed the Rev. Jackson is emerging as the latest civil-rights leader. Between meetings in Chicago's South Side he has made trips to Los Angeles and New York, and has given his point of view to newspaper correspondents.

He says that if the United States is more concerned over the effects of pollution on birds and fish than it is for men, women and children there will be retaliation on a massive scale. An economic 'cold war' against white American business, he thinks, holds much more prospect of success than any 'hot war' against the armoured strength of the internal security forces. As an example, he argues that the boycott of a discriminatory store immediately gains him a platform from which he can denounce the storekeeper's practices; whereas if one smashes the windows of the store the cops immediately crackdown. He argues that even national industries will feel the pinch when the blacks of 40 cities are organised sufficiently to start an immediate boycott. Even the mere threat of a boycott, he noted, in Chicago has procured thousands of jobs for blacks, and produced new markets for Negro businessmen. With a touch of cynicism he adds that "A man's drive to survive is stronger than his drive to be moral or ethical." You can knock men's principles until doomsday and nothing happens; but knock their pockets and, brother, their principles immediately receive a successful kiss of life.

Army Aid

The Rev. Jackson has not, presumably, read Douglas Hyde but, great minds occasionally thinking alike, he suggested in testimony before the Senate's hunger committee that Army and National Guard troops, used for the violent suppression of slum riots during the long heats of summer, should be used in freezing winters to distribute food and 'provide health care'. The troops will then be seen to be not merely guard dogs for the middle classes but a truly national force which is used to help and defend the poor against ferocious onslaughts of hunger and cold. President Nixon's proposed plan to ensure poor families a minimum annual income of \$1,600 was, I think, somewhat too summarily dismissed by the Rev Jackson. The figure of \$1,600, he said, 'bore little relation to the cost of raising a family of four in an inflated economy'. And that is true, but it is bad tactics to turn down a small improvement in the hope of gaining a larger. First secure the minor improvement — and then later go for the larger, and another small improvement will be forthcoming.

Political Philosophies

Political philosophies, or to call them by a less grand name, ideologies are two a penny. They are worked out everyday in academic fastnesses remote from reality. On the other hand the pragmatic approach carries all before it — but slowly, ever so slowly: inch by inch a decade. The very slowness of the advance lulls the public enemy into a false sense of security. Admittedly 'the inevitability of gradualness' drives the hot heads into paroxysms of abusive hate, and turns the ideologues sour with contempt. But no effective trade unionist or politician ever lets himself be put off his stroke by such futile and irrelevant men. They cannot see the facts for the theories. The classic example was Attlee's dismissal of Harold Laski. He was free to play with his utopian blueprints but as soon as he began to speak for the government he was fired.

The Rev. Jackson's apparent freedom from ideology

looks promising. Without dreaming of mentioning it, he seems to favour the inch by inch a decade improvement. (No one can run up Everest.) The white and black communities of America are separate; the "whites control themselves, but they also control us". So far, he argues, black America has merely reacted to white America. Boycotts, sit-ins, direct action or violence are products of white leadership. To change this the black man has got to realise that he is *somebody*.

Effective Slogans

The Rev. Jackson organises Saturday morning meetings. In a theatre in Chicago's South Side there is an audience of 4,000. The dynamic preacher calls out: *I may be poor, but I am . . .* and the choir and the audience thunder **SOMEBODY**. *I may be uneducated, but I am . . . SOMEBODY. I may be on welfare, but I am . . . SOMEBODY. I may be in jail but I am . . . SOMEBODY.* A desk-bound office wallah will sneer at this, but it is the only way to the collective mind and heart. After the slogan chanting come the facts. The Chicago population is made up of 42 per cent blacks, but there are more unregistered black voters in Chicago than in the state of Mississippi. (How can you use democratic procedures if you haven't even a vote?) To the reply that it would cost too much to register the neighbourhoods, the Rev. Jackson retorts: "That's the price of democracy." Although nearly half the population of Chicago is black those who make the decisions have among them only 2 per cent of blacks. And the Rev. Jackson is for ever driving home the important fact that before there can be improvement there must be a sense of personal worth. "If a man has a high expectation of himself, he will be in conflict with the slums." A man only becomes a slave, or allows himself to be downgraded if he accepts 'a status other than manhood'. (Surely it is because of this inborn sense of personal worth that all the revolutionaries have come from middle-class or upper middle-class homes?)

Eloquence and Revolutions

The Rev. Jackson has not the eloquence of Martin Luther King. Few men have. When did we last hear anything so stirring as the speech which was punctuated by Dr. King's refrain 'I have a dream'? But the Rev. Jackson is said to have the ability to speak for the violent young black as well as for the paunchy conservative businessman. And the slow inch by inch a decade improvement gets along quite well without the eloquent man who more often than not frightens the wits out of his opponents; and frequently, in fact, inspires counter action.

A British radical, Morgan Philips Price, in his recent book *My Three Revolutions* (Allen and Unwin, 63s) has added valuable confirming testimony and has heartened those of us who have for a long time believed in the inch by inch a decade improvement political philosophy. He was in Russia in 1917 and afterwards as 'Manchester Guardian's' correspondent; and witnessed the German revolution which he reported for the 'Daily Herald'. It is his conviction that the revolution in England during his long lifetime has been no less profound than the Revolution he witnessed in Russia. England is obviously a much more civilised country than it was seventy years ago; bearing in mind the definition (as good as we have) of civilisation given by that illogical tory, Dr. Johnson. He said:

"Where a great proportion of the people are suffered to languish in helpless misery, that country must be ill policed, and wretchedly governed: a decent provision for the poor is the truest test of civilisation. Gentlemen of education were pretty much the same in all countries; the condition of the lower orders, the poor especially, was the true mark of national discrimination."

How the national discrimination will react to the Rev. Jesse L. Jackson's demand that the 25 million blacks of the United States be treated as somebodies it is not hard to guess. For there are no methods, in the politics of the country as yet, to do much that is worthwhile for one-

eighth of the population. The expenditure on the war in Vietnam is and has been enormous. And when the war ends the money is likely to be spent on new highway programmes, plusher airports, beautifying the national parks, better transit facilities in the suburbs, wealthier universities, and possibly less income tax; though this last is not likely in view of the fact that the United States has had the largest deficit in its balance of payments in its history. In short it may well be the mixture as before: goodies for the well-off, and a terrific showdown on HEW (Health, Education, Welfare) spending. \$1,600 as a guaranteed annual income plus a supplement of as much as \$800 in food stamps for a family of four has already been branded by the American Conservative Union and other right-wing groups as 'socialism'. Redistribution of national wealth requires radical changes in politics. And nothing like that is happening at the moment. General paralysis is in command, and polarisation, the division of the community into two hostile camps, continues apace. And what makes the outlook grim is the lining up together on a great variety of issues of many diverse elements. For example, the advanced churchman all for the 'new theology' condemns the U.S. as racist, opposes involvement in Vietnam, abuses suburbanites, supports the rioters on the campus, and joins up with almost any rebel in order to present a united front of revolt. On the other side 'the forgotten Americans', the 'silent majority' and 'middle America' is allegedly monolithic in its contempt for the plight of the poor, its hawkishness, and its hostility for the young.

We on the sidelines of history, soon to be overtaken by the mêlée and already involved nightly in it on our television screens can only ask for a big hand for the Rev. Jesse L. Jackson and his 25 million blacks. Everyone has the right to be SOMEBODY. 'A status other than manhood' is totally unacceptable.

The liberal democracy for all its goodness has here and there failed to achieve the results expected. In proportion to the extension of the vote, demonstrations often violent and growing in violence, are found on every side reading from Left to Right and from Celtic to Saxon lands. The 19th century optimists have been confounded. Edwards suggests that people are rebelling against the centralisation and concentration of power and the Leviathan State. He suggests syndical and decentralising solutions and calls in question the conventional opinion that the world needs a super-state.

Violence and Liberal Democracy

HENRY EDWARDS

IN THEORY, liberal democracy enables all citizens to take their part in the government of their State. Exactly what "their part" is may not be altogether clear. Perhaps, for the moment, it will suffice to say that each citizen is enabled to take "some part". Then again, I wrote "the liberal democracy", fully aware that States, especially as they reflect true nations, do not as a rule have the same liberal democracies, if they have them at all.

Political Institutions and National Characteristics

Disraeli once rebuked a large if hard-to-define constituency in these islands for regarding the English system as if it were a model farm. He insisted that political institutions, to be worth having must reflect national

characteristics. This view is, of course, that of the historic polity; but the historic polity, especially when it shows democratic facets — i.e. some participation in the suffrage by at least some citizens — tends to be “developed” on *a priori* lines, so that it becomes a liberal democracy fairly satisfying to the austere rationalist. The English historic polity has “developed” in this way, especially by ceasing to regard the vote as the privilege of “the Commons” of England and by starting to regard it as the right, first of adult males, then of adult females, and now of everyone over the age of eighteen. Such “development” may be an improvement, but it is not really development. There has been a change not of degree, but of kind. In the process “privilege” has well nigh disappeared, even the notion of the Commons of England as a privileged constituency, though we still have vestiges of the Commons, as in the expression, “the senior burgess of Heckmondwike”. Since 1536, Wales has been by law an integral part of England. I may record, at this point, a curious dialogue on a Rhondda hustings in 1950 when the local Nationalist candidate, the poet and dramatist, J. K. Davies, was asked what miners lodge or lodges nominated him. He swiftly replied, “no miners lodges nominated me or the Labour candidate”. There was uproar. But Mr. Davies insisted. And his interlocutors had to concede defeat. All who signed the nomination forms signed as burgesses, not as trade unionists. In spite of this constitutional circumstance, there is an understood system whereby at Westminster a number of M.P.’s are said to represent certain non-geographical constituencies. The senior burgess for Ogmore represents the distributive workers. Before he became Secretary of State for Wales, Mr. George Thomas claimed in the House of Commons that he represented the teachers. Big business no doubt has its representatives, though in all such representation we may have to distinguish between real representation and mere delegation. The general result is characteristically English, so a foreigner like me may dare say. But, in 1866, the Conservatives tried to get a bill passed that would procure the vocational vote. It was dismissed,

especially by the Liberals, as "the fancy franchise". One excellent example of such a fancy franchise was the university vote which returned some capable and scholarly men and a woman to Westminster. That was the only exception and I believe many parliamentarians were grieved or are grieved now that in the name of *égalité* it was destroyed.

"Equal Laws" and Universal Suffrage

The provision of "equal laws" and universal suffrage (I may from time to time forget the subtle difference between the franchise and the suffrage) seems to redound to the credit of lawgivers anxious to mete out justice to all men within the domain of the State. When, however, we see that it does not have the effect the theorists expect, we ought to see whether there may not be something wrong at the root of the theory. In France, for example, the provision of "equal laws" has led to evident injustices to minorities, e.g. the Bretons who form a real nation. Any concession to such minorities is said to smack of "privilege". But England retains a quite considerable fund of common sense on such matters, even if the English lack a sense of logic. They do not really regard it as privilege that one of my nephews was taught all subjects through the medium of Welsh. As a result, some English legislation is by way of "grace and favour". The treatment of genuine pacifists in war-time is an example. The present legal position of the Welsh tongue is another. But that will not do for many malcontents in Wales, who will not regard their native tongue as one that depends upon the grace and favour of the English government. They demand complete legal status, even if this means, as I believe it does, repealing at least part of the Act of Incorporation.

Welsh Singers and English Courts

Londoners have been treated by certain of the Welsh language extremists to the first Gymanfa Ganu at the English law courts, as a result of which some of the singers were sentenced for contempt of court. Perhaps the severity of

the sentences had somewhat to do with the judge's lack of aesthetic regard for Welsh hymns and songs. But I mention this curious precedent first because it is, at the time of writing, the nearest to hand. If we care to look back over the last sixty years or so, we shall see that despite the theoretical representation of "the people" at Westminster, a-political demonstrations, some of which have been most violent, have grown in numbers. During the stormy days of Chartism, Disraeli made a little known speech on the subject in which he championed the Chartist cause, not because he believed in their formulae for civil quiet and content, but because he saw that their civil rights had been invaded. Acting fully on the principle of "Commons privilege" ("the Commons" is not the House of Commons), he pointed to the upsetting effects of the Whig reform of the suffrage, a reform which had put inordinate power into the hands of what Disraeli called "a monarchy of the Middle Class". As a result, the new proletariat had become depressed. That was why he had already envisaged that later "fancy franchise" whereby workmen qua workmen had their representatives at Westminster; yes, and lawyers, teachers, doctors and other professional groups. (But see the Catholic teaching on vocational groups.)

The First Data in a Free Society

The theorists of the liberal democracy did not realise, as philosophical conservatives like Coleridge realised, that the first data in a true society are not individuals but forces, clusters, contents, customs, interests and relationships. There is a terrific nexus of contents interlocked and suffused. It is indicated in the concept of "the Thing", a word that turns up in Scandinavia for the assembly of the folk, "the Allthing". Because the theorists did not realise this, the real groups that go to make a great society were likely to become less and less content. By the turn of the century we had the beginnings of syndicalism with its mild brother, guild socialism, suffragettes, the Irish bloc, M.P.s pledged to get home rule for Scotland and Wales (at least

forty or so of these), republicans and a growing number of the merely discontented. Then came the Tonypandy riots which were really a local war similar to the local war in the Irish Six Counties which, at the time of writing, shows little signs of abating. Syndicalist revolt had its last field day in the General Strike. But Georges Sorel was right when, in his *Reflections on Violence*, he prophesised that the English worker would never understand the policy of direct action and workers control. For Sorel there were no "men" but rather Englishmen, Frenchmen, Scotsmen, Germans *et cetera*. In terms of specific action he seems to have been right.

Liberal Democracy and Demonstration

A friend of mine once compiled in the thirties, a small book, in which he showed that, with the advance in the liberal democracy, strikes and similar a-political means had grown by leaps and bounds. He would find it even easier to compile a large work on the subject nowadays. For, what constituency does not demonstrate nowadays? Students, CNDers, Trade Unionists, Farmers, Teachers, who, though trade unionists, are supposed to be so nice as never to strike, Anti-Apartheid-ers, Friends of Rhodesia and the Republic of South Africa, Anti-Common-Marketeers, and umpteen groups interested in the fate of this or that alien State or group, such, for example, as Biafra. It would almost be true to say, "you name it and I'll show you a demonstration". If there is any "law" in this strange progress, it would appear to be true to predict that, when the over-eighteens begin voting, demonstrations with their normal violent concomitants will increase yet again. But it was widely believed (from the time of John Stuart Mill) that the advance of education — that is, its diffusion through all social classes — would conduce to social peace. "What we principally thought of", wrote John Stuart Mill in his *Autobiography*, "was to alter people's opinions; to make them believe according to the evidence and know what was their real interest, which, when they once knew, they would,

we thought, by the instrument of opinion, enforce a regard to it upon one another". And Ramsay MacDonald was saying much the same thing when he wrote: "The Independent Labour Party does not believe in the class conflict as supplying a political method. It strives to transform through education, through raising standards of mental and moral qualities, through the acceptance of programmes by reason of their justice, morality and wisdom".

This was and still is — while some celebrate the centenary of the great Education Act explicitly designed to enable Britain to compete with Germany in world markets — the optimistic theory of an allegedly rational man whose will had not been weakened and whose intellect had not been ravaged. To advance the aims of the optimists, three main institutions were devised: firstly, written constitutions (and even England has partially failed to keep her unwritten constitution), which would envelop the sphere of economic activity in the overcoat of legal guarantees and compel irrational forces into a system of legal chain-armour; secondly, independent courts, which would rationally discern what was rational from what was irrational; thirdly, popularly elected parliaments, which would subject conflicting views and interests to the test of reason through discussion — with compromise as the general outcome.

The Middle Class, Violence and Power

With good reason this view is often identified with the middle-class outlook. The middle class, which produces men and women of signal valour, is yet averse from violence as a means to win power. The Middle Class, for the most part, gained great power in many parts of the world by non-violent methods; that is, by indirect domination through economic dependence (on which Pope John commented in *Mater et Magistra*), which hid the power relations behind superficial egalitarian rules — as if trade were really so egalitarian. It has always seemed to me important that both Marx and Disraeli, who were both middle class, saw how the mood of the middle class was

penetrating all social classes. In our own day, men such as T. S. Eliot have warned us of the collar and tie tyranny that may well replace that of the hammer and sickle. A typically middle-class pronouncement was that of L. T. Hobhouse: "It is the essence of liberalism to oppose the use of force, the basis of all tyranny." (To a large extent political liberalism was of the middle-class.) Critics would see in the employment of numerical forces — as in elections — a middle class mode of using force, as if law were the product of numbers. In this connection Nicholas Berdyaev, looking at the matter from his own essentially Russian point of view, saw the bourgeois liberal democracy of western Europe as a kind of limbo where truth and untruth, justice and injustice achieved an awful parity, the only decision being arrived at by a ballot box and the other apparatus of the liberal democracy. What was this? Truth? Justice? Both are holy. Both are whole. No wonder the middle class hated war with its own kind of hatred. The Quaker, John Bright, had Quaker reasons for abhorring war. But he could also say, as a typical representative of the rising middle class, concerning the Crimean war, "our carpet trade is grievously injured by this war because of the rising price of tow (flax)". A century before Bright a character in the *Spectator*, Sir Andrew Freeport, was talking just like that.

Authoritarian Government no Answer

Critics of this view have supposed that it is allowable and proven in the domestic field. They are too sanguine. And we see the disproof. But if the liberal democracy has failed at home, may we consider some corrective? The obvious one is the formation of some authoritarian government (as if liberal democracies do not have to provide such government by mumbo jumbo, to quote Belloc).

But there is surely another way. I believe that a strongly disposing cause of so much social violence today in respect of conflicts with government is due to the growing centralisation of government as a result of which people individually

and in groups feel with good reason that they live far away from the seat of authority. In my own land people as a rule have a congenital dislike of centralised government, and I believe this is also true of the Scots. We dislike aggregations of power of any kind. Again, we have sharply distinguished society from State. During the week of ecumenical prayer I happened to be on a panel which was asked questions upon education and religion. In my answer I referred to a valuable publication of the Cymrodon several decades ago in which it was shown that the national education was based on societies and so on society rather than on the State. Such essentially national education actually tended to be un-national in proportion as it was state-based. At the risk of being accused of syndicalism — and I believe that there is much to be said for the syndicalist solution in many ways — I believe that we need to rear up particular societies or communes which would have power at their elbows.

Decentralisation and Stability

This has to do with one of my subordinate reasons for giving qualified support to Welsh and Scottish Nationalisms. In both countries there exists a much stronger sense of local variations and communal characteristics, than in England. The pre-1536 Welsh law of virtual gavelkind produced a tone of well-diffused ownership. The very weaknesses of Welsh life — "divisive" is the vogue and emotive word — have conduced to the loss of Welsh sovereignty but have created strong local societies that still survive. The Scottish horizontal and vertical social stratifications had much the same effect. Besides the former, the traditional estates, were the regional variations that led to the formation of a Parliament at Islay for the Western Isles. If the tensions between lowlander and highlander (often puffed up by aliens) and between clan and clan produced weaknesses similar to those of Wales, they had much to do with the still potent sense of independence of the Scot as *liber legalis homo* — even to a certain individualistic exaggeration with

so many Scots' interest in "rights" and what I may call a "wee-free" attitude.

Now I am very well aware that there are powerful forces that plead today for a concentration of power, for, let us say, some world parliament or even some more puissant force. They look with horror at what they may call with journalistic tongue "the Balkanisation" of these isles, and for that matter of Europe. It is not wrong or right to be old-fashioned. But I certainly think they are old-fashioned if only that they still think of social government in terms of the State. Many years ago in the *Catholic Times*, (a periodical whose death I still regret), I stated that a certain Catholic M.P. was wrong in calling for a stable government, which he opposed to a weak one. If by "stable" he meant "strong" (and the context suggested it), he erred. The anarchist heresy yet rests upon a truth about government which may be stated by saying that a good government is the better for being a weak one. Even Disraeli once exclaimed; "It is always the State, never society", in an attack on his Liberal foes, with their interest in organisation, an interest which today in the name of liberty has led to the Snooper State par excellence.

Liberal Rationalism not Enough

Having said so much, how can I sufficiently oppose that spirit of violence that feeds on the false worship of violence? There is much of that about — and I do not mean just the corner boys who do violence for kicks and giggles. Behind them is a manichean gangsterdom that dotes on the destruction of anything. Mere turbulence, mere agitation, mere restlessness, mere instability and mere disorder are evil and may be diabolic. There is a constant struggle, open or latent, between the depraved particular will of unregenerate man and the necessary laws (perhaps prescriptive rather than statutory) and relationships in society.

But the liberal democrat must at least modify that specious optimism that still dazzles him against the highway. Let him look at the terrifying, certainly pessimistic

and tragic words of de Maistre: "There is nothing but violence in the universe; but we are spoilt by modern philosophy which has been telling us that all is good. Evil has sullied all and in a true sense all is evil since nothing stands in its place. All beings groan and strain with effort and sadness towards another order of things". He was not at all manichean in this, since he explicitly makes the point that the tone of things is due not to creation itself but to the Fall of Man. But, even if he did overstress that aspect, he yet repudiated the basic assumption of the rational order in which liberals believe. Moreover, I believe it will be found that the "upwards-forwards" theory of a de Chardin with that false faith in Evolution (as opposed to an acceptance of evolution as a working theory) is equally to be condemned. Catholics who dare say with Chardin that they believe in a world, one and infallible, to which they are ready to abandon themselves, may even get by in our disturbed State and even become "leading".

But I would kneel with de Maistre — "like a sinner supplicating grace, accepting in advance all the punishment that may fall upon my head as a small repayment for the immense debt I have incurred towards eternal justice".

In this article Dr. Jackson explains the advantages of reverse income tax: it would certainly extend help to the sick, the disabled and to pensioners. But would it help the low paid worker?

Reverse Income Tax

J. M. JACKSON

THE idea of the negative or reverse income tax is basically very simple. It is that every citizen should be required to file a return of his income to the Inland Revenue as at present. If, however, his income falls below a certain prescribed level, which will, of course, be related to the size of his family, he will be entitled to receive an appropriate allowance from the government instead of having to pay them tax. At present, a person whose income is inadequate to meet certain minimum requirements can, subject to an important qualification, be given Supplementary Benefit. To receive Supplementary Benefit, he must make a special application. It is this special application that the advocates of reverse income tax would like to eliminate. Many people who are in need and entitled to benefit may be reluctant to claim it. They do not like accepting 'charity'; they do not like the close scrutiny of their means before they are given benefit*; they may feel that the stigma associated with Public Assistance in the inter-war years remains. The change from National Assistance to Supplementary Benefit has done something to alter the image but, for one reason

* There can be no valid objection to their having to disclose their income. The poor have no more right to secrecy in this matter than the wealthier citizens who must disclose their incomes in order that tax liabilities may be assessed. But there may be a valid objection to a particular method of disclosure, perhaps necessarily involving a face to face meeting with an official; and perhaps with the impression being sometimes given that the claimant's word is doubted.

or another, there is probably still a fair number of people who do not seek the benefits they both need and are entitled to.

I said there was one important qualification to the statement that people with an income below a prescribed level were entitled to Supplementary Benefit. People who have retired or are sick or unemployed may claim Supplementary Benefit if their incomes fall below the scale laid down from time to time. Men who are in full time employment and whose incomes are below the Supplementary Benefit scale are not, however, entitled to help. The advocates of a reverse income tax believe that these people could be helped by this means, more effectively than by Family Allowances or a National Minimum Wage. I am not so sure that this would be the case.

Long-term Beneficiaries

I would certainly agree that a reverse income tax could extend help to a good many pensioners and disabled. The needs of these people are likely to remain more or less unchanged over the course of a year or even many years. To ensure that help is given to all such persons without subjecting them to a type of inquiry that may be felt in some way to be embarrassing is all to the good. There would be some risk of greater abuse than at present. There would be some people in this kind of situation who would fail to declare all their income, just as this happens with some wealthier citizens who want to reduce their tax liabilities. On the whole, it seems unlikely that this abuse would be on a serious scale.

Because the needs of pensioners and the disabled are likely to remain unchanged, there is no great difficulty in the Inland Revenue examining the return of income that has been filed, and, where appropriate, assessing a negative tax liability and arranging for this to be paid through drafts on the Post Office. These payments could be made weekly or monthly as might be appropriate. The precise method of

calculating the reverse income tax is a matter that must be looked at later.

Short-term Needs

Short-term needs present two main problems. The first is purely administrative. A man becomes unemployed and has no income or only one that is inadequate. He has been receiving an income that may have just been adequate, but now ceases to be. The present PAYE system takes a man's income to date, assumes that his weekly earnings to date will be maintained over the rest of the tax year, and ensures that the amount deducted in tax at the end of, say, the second month of the tax year is one sixth of his total tax liability *assuming his average earnings remain the same*. If his income ceases, who is to identify his need? He may be reporting to the Employment Exchange seeking work, or he may be sick. But will this automatically put him in touch with a department that will be responsible for identifying that he is now in need?

There is a further problem in assessment. PAYE calculates tax liability on the assumption that average earnings to date are maintained for the rest of the tax year, and that at any date in the tax year one has paid an appropriate proportion of one's total liability for the year. Suppose a man works for two weeks of the tax year and earns £15 a week. If he goes on earning at this rate, he will earn £780 in the course of the year. He might be liable to pay £52 in tax in the course of the year, if his earnings in fact total £780. The PAYE tables will ensure that after two weeks he will have paid £2 on a strict *pro rata* basis. If, in the third week, he has no income, his average earnings fall to £10 a week or £520 a year, and this might reduce his total tax liability to, say, £26. This means that after three weeks he ought to have paid a total of 30s. He would therefore be entitled to a refund of 10s. tax already paid, but this is hardly enough to keep him. It is difficult to see how to meet this kind of need without the existence of some such organisation as the present Ministry of Pensions and Social

Security and its machinery for awarding Supplementary Benefits.

The Low Paid Worker

It has been suggested that the reverse income tax could also help the low paid worker. Here I think there would be very grave difficulties. With such workers, it would be desirable to ensure that their income *in any particular week* at least reached a prescribed minimum. The present PAYE tables are not designed for this purpose. They might be manipulated to ensure that a man's average earnings over the tax year to date did not fall below this minimum. Let us suppose that a man needs a minimum income of £10 a week. If his income rises above £12 a week (on average) he becomes liable to tax at a rate of 5s. in the pound.* Suppose he earns £15 a week for two weeks. By the end of the second week, he should have paid 30s. in tax. If he earns nothing in the third week, he would then have average earnings of £10 a week and entitled to the refund of his 30s. tax paid, but to no additional help. If his income remained zero for the fourth week, his average earnings fall to £7 10s. and he would be entitled to £10 reverse tax. In the fourth week, that is, he is entitled to the difference between the need for a total income of £40 over a four week period and the £30 actually received. From now on, he may be adequately catered for during prolonged loss of earnings (subject to the existence of suitable administrative machinery), but there was the third week when his need was not covered. The longer he has worked at a good wage, the longer will be the period during which he is not assessed as entitled to reverse tax. This difficulty *could* be overcome by tables which related tax liability (including entitlement to receive reverse tax) to pay in a particular week as well as

* For simplicity in my examples I am not attempting to use the tax rates and allowances that apply in Britain today. I am using assumptions that are much simpler, but which nevertheless show the kind of effect which is produced by the system of collection which we use for PAYE. This system of collection may, of course, be used with other systems for assessing liability for tax than that currently employed.

the existing cumulative tables (extended of course for reverse tax). This, however, might make the scheme unduly onerous for employers to operate.*

Perhaps the objection that for the man in employment the reverse tax, calculated on a cumulative basis, might not raise his earnings to the prescribed minimum is not too serious. So long as his income over a longer period is taken into account, all might be well. No serious harm is done if his income falls below the minimum in an occasional week. There is, however, a danger that he might lose a well paid job and move to another that was paid less than the prescribed minimum. He might then be in the position of appearing, on the basis of cumulative earnings, of still being above the minimum for a considerable period. If he has had no cause to foresee something of this kind occurring, he may well suffer considerable hardship.

So much for the *difficulty* of adapting a scheme to the needs of the low paid worker. I am not sure, however, that this is the desirable way of trying to help the low paid worker. If employers know that the taxpayer will supplement low wages, there is a danger that they will be encouraged to go on paying low wages rather than improve their efficiency so that they can afford higher wages. On the whole, I would prefer a system of improved Family Allowances combined with a National Minimum Wage. The Minimum Wage might be set high enough to meet the minimum needs of a married man with one child (including rent). This might be fixed around £13 a week. Family Allowances might be given at a rate of say 35s. a week.* If it is feared that Family Allowances also permit the employer to pay lower wages than would otherwise be necessary the remedy would be to abolish the present system that pays

* Although in my example above, I have assumed a man loses all his income after the second week, the same kind of result can occur when his income has been above the prescribed minimum for some weeks and then drops below.

* The £13 minimum would not create as many difficulties as a minimum of £15 or £16; the level of family allowances proposed would give the standard rate taxpayer roughly the same net benefit as at present, but would give substantially increased benefit to those with lower levels of pay.

them out of general taxation and to make them payable from a special payroll tax on employers.*

Wider Objectives of Reverse Income Tax

The objective of the reverse income tax is to provide assistance for those in need without their having to make a special application as for Supplementary Benefit at present. Some of the advocates, however, hope to achieve something more than just allowing a pensioner or disabled person to get the help he is entitled to without the stigma of applying for Supplementary Benefit. They believe that the scheme could replace many existing cash benefits provided by the Welfare State and also the National Health Service, if combined with an appropriate reduction of taxation to enable people to pay for their own medical care. These wider objectives raise, of course, further difficulties. If the present National Insurance benefits are to be replaced, it will be necessary to overcome the difficulties already indicated about making the scheme flexible enough to cope with short-term needs. This is primarily an administrative problem, but still an important one. Another difficulty concerns the preservation of incentives for people to continue to make efforts to provide for themselves something better than a scheme which, as a minimum, already offers more than some National Insurance benefits.*

This is a more difficult issue to which it will be necessary to return in a second article. This must also deal with the different forms a reverse income tax might take, and with some additional problems that might arise in trying to eliminate the National Health Service as part of the same package.

- This could replace some existing taxes on firms to avoid placing an increased burden on them. With a percentage payroll tax earmarked for this purpose, rates for Family Allowances could be increased in line with changes in wage levels from time to time.
- National Insurance benefits for the sick and unemployed fall far short of subsistence level except for those whose earnings are high enough to gain them an adequate earnings related supplement — and then only for the first six months.

If God is infinitely just, how could He make hell? Except for little pockets of resistance will religion disappear under the attacks of atheism and technology? Is the steady increase of leisure a threat to happiness?

Any Questions ?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

If God is infinitely just, how could He make hell?

Your question should start "As", not "If". That change would remove from your words the querulous — or is it unbelieving? — note. To complain about God's dispositions, or to express doubt of Christ's teaching, does not befit one of God's creatures. The right attitude is first to believe — to *know* on God's authority — and then to try and understand, with the certainty that in our approach to God we are moving into the darkness of mystery.

Is it unfair to suspect that, at the back of your mind when you were framing the question, there was an idea of God as a supreme planner, making provision for the ultimate residence of the human race, with a home for the good and a prison for the bad? Hell is not so much a place as persons, and the persons make their personality out of the being that God gave them and his unfailing help in the construction of themselves. In that sense it is created persons who make hell.

Or is it punishment you object to? That would put you in the fashion. The cry of "victimisation" that is raised when anyone is punished for breach of the peace or of law or of contract suggests that there are many who think that no behaviour of theirs can be bad or that, in any case, they should not be held responsible for it. But that is an implicit denial of their own freedom and personality. For

a man to demand immunity from retribution he has brought on himself is to demean himself: it is tantamount to saying that he is not free or that he has not the courage of his convictions.

Being a person you must make your choices and take their consequences.

What are the chances of religion disappearing except for little pockets of resistance, under the attacks of militant atheism and technology?

In spite of all the penalties for religious observance in most communist countries, religion is still practised, and in more than isolated pockets. It is practised where atheists are making a dead set against it, trying to bring about legislation abolishing official teaching of religion in primary schools and recommending a system of morality without a religious basis.

Technology, as far as I know, makes no direct assault on religion; but it can induce a concentration of interest on the temporal and the material, so that the fact of the sacred in human life is neglected. Most observers seem convinced that society is becoming increasingly and rapidly secularized—that is, the world is becoming more worldly: matter and nothing more; time and nothing more. One element in that process is atheistic propaganda, and another is man's preoccupation with human nature, and a growing mastery over it. The teaching of religion meets with the blank opposition of indifference; and religion seems to be thrown back on itself to become the possession of a diminishing flock. It could well belong eventually to small groups of militants and martyrs.

If that were to happen, religion would return sooner or later. It is essential to human society, because it supplies a need of man which cannot be met in any other way. Whatever humanists may say, God is reality; and the great religions of the world are proof that man in every age has turned to him. Without that direction he is disorientated. Man is lost in a society without religion, and to find him-

self he will have to rediscover the Being whose existence makes sense of the human race and gives it a satisfying purpose.

Is the steady increase in leisure a threat to happiness?

It certainly is, unless work and leisure are properly understood. Work is not a curse on mankind, called down by sin; it is the blessed enjoyment of man's gifts in their exercise. The tragedy of long-term unemployment is not chiefly the loss of livelihood but rather the inability to exert oneself as a human being. It is sad that work in itself has been given a bad name by the exploitation of workers by overworking them and depriving them of their wages. It is a human need and it should be a delight. How shocking that for so many it has been made boring and wearisome! All the more reason for reducing the time spent in making a living.

But the time thus saved must not be "killed". That would be to exchange a boring job for a worse. Time is not so plentiful in any life that it can be heavy; and anyone who has trouble in filling his time should examine his conscience. Time should be both taut and elastic: it should never hang like a loop of wet string. It will be properly tense and extensible only if it is filled with the right employment of talent or with well-deserved relaxation after work. Leisure, therefore, must be a free space for jobs which are humanly satisfying. It should not be thought of as merely play-time.

Education for leisure is necessary. It could help to give new interests and develop latent capacities. But leisure must not be made a synonym of retirement from work. We have our abilities for the benefit of mankind, to "bear one another's burdens". If technology cuts down the time when we must work for a living, we shall have time in which to work so that others may live.

Is there any truth in the charge that the new rite of the Mass was designed, by its likeness to a communion service, to promote ecumenism between Catholics and Anglicans?

The new rite of Mass was designed for the whole Church, and to suppose that it was planned to meet the ecumenical problems of about one hundredth of the Church's population is to be extravagantly self-centred. The vast majority of Catholics have never heard of Cranmer or the various Prayer Books or the Edwardian and Elizabethan religious settlements, nor do they feel the need to accommodate themselves to Lutheran or Calvinist or other Protestant practices. The new rite is presented on its own merits, as a worthy offering of the permanent Christian Sacrifice.

I know that some English Catholics are uneasy about the new rite. Their tradition is of faithfulness to the Vicar of Christ. They have been loyal to him in conscious opposition to those who have acquiesced in the assumption of headship by Henry VIII, and they have stressed their Roman allegiance as a sort of defiance to Anglicanism. The Latin of the Mass has in that way acquired the extra value of a symbol. English in the liturgy has almost an heretical sound; and Mass in the vernacular seems to recall Cranmer. It would be a pity to lose the Latin Mass altogether — it is even necessary for polyglot congregations and where, in India and Africa for example, a vernacular is hard to find. But we shall soon become accustomed to the Mass in English. As the Pope has insisted, to reassure the doubtful, it is the same Mass we have always had. That in English it should recall the Book of Common Prayer is not surprising, seeing that the Book recalls the Roman Missal.

If we believe in God and follow his commands, do we have to believe in the Church?

You don't *have* to believe anything. It's up to you. The gift of faith is not imposed but offered; and it can be accepted or rejected.

The "faith" that you talk about is not a single undivided reality. Your belief in God could be the natural acknowledgement of the existence of your Creator, and the assumption of duties to Him under the heading of the Ten Commandments. That is not faith in the theological sense, and it does not include acceptance of Christ and the Church. To reach them you would need, as Christ said, to be "drawn by the Father"—to be offered the gift of faith.

What does arise out of a genuine awareness of God is an interest in claims that He has given us human beings some direct intimation of His nature and our duty to Him. One such claim, which almost no adult in the world can be ignorant of, is made by Christianity. For a matter so vital you would have, in honesty, to give time and trouble, studying the evidence for the historical value of the Bible, investigating the Christian belief in Christ's divinity, and taking at least a cursory look at this historical Church. You can't read yourself into faith; but your willingness to be open to God's revelation, if He has made one, is a good predisposition for a greater enlightenment, if one is to be gained.

It would be interesting to know if you have any allegiance to an established religion. Man being a social animal, it is normal for him to join with his fellows in his worship. A strictly individual religion is rare and strange. If yours is that sort, you ought to be looking for a "Church".

BOOK REVIEWS

Seeds of Dissent

Keeping Your Balance in the Modern Church
by Fr. Hugh J. O'Connell; Ligourian Pamphlets,
Ligouri, Missouri 63057, \$1.00; pp. 184.

Does Conscience Decide? by Bishop Philbin;
Irish CTS, 1s. pp. 48.

Trimming the Ark by Christopher Derrick;
Hutchinson, 21s.; pp. 153.

Early on in his most excellent booklet, Father O'Connell stresses the part played by personalism in the outlook of the *periti* who played so large a part in shaping the thinking of the Second Vatican Council.

There were perhaps two strands that led to this personalist approach. In the first place, the Nazi regime in Europe had sought brutally to crush the individual and make of him nothing more than a conforming robot whose value was drawn not from himself and his dignity, but solely from his ability to serve the state machine. The reaction after the war that followed the attempted imposition of this totalitarian brutality was immense. We are still feeling its effects today. The revolt against authority of those who suffered under the obscenities of the Nazi regime is still sustained, in altered form, by their children. The precious concept of the individual human being as all-important in himself, discovered by those who sought, at any cost and despite almost unendurable suffering, to preserve their personal integrity, is something their children have seized on in the new world of personal relationships, which they are trying to make for themselves.

Almost inevitably, against this sort of background, Catholic thinking in Europe during and after the last war took a strongly subjective turn. We are brought to the second strand. It was but natural, under the circumstances,

that European philosophers and theologians should turn to discover what they could in the works of their Protestant counterparts whose minds had been running in strongly subjectivist channels for more than a century. Perhaps the best sections of Father O'Connell's book are those in which he shows the effect of Descartes, Kant and von Harnack on the Protestant theologians of the last fifty years and now on contemporary Catholic thinking.

Father O'Connell is quick to point out that there is nothing wrong—in fact, much good—in setting the human person more squarely in the context of Catholic theology. There is a balance here to be redressed. The rot starts, however, when the place of the person is exaggerated at the expense of objective truth, when personalism passes over into subjectivism; when revelation is whittled down in the supposed interests of personality, with religion framed to suit man, not man to religion. At once, under such circumstances, we are in trouble. Neo-modernism comes in as religion is valued no longer objectively in itself; but only for its effect on the individual.

This is the virus which is eating its way into the Church today, a subjective rationalism which makes God in the image of man and judges the value of religious belief by its effect on human personality. Religion, it is said, must be relevant, fit for the times; be content to have its validity judged in terms of its power to suit the aspirations of that strange creature who is constantly referred to as "modern man". Anything about it that does not suit must be junked, as Bultmann has been so quick to proclaim: demythologization—to use his horrible Teutonic word—is essential if Christ's word is to survive. What matters, according to him, is not whether Christ existed or not; but only that his message—or Kergyma—should reach modern ears. The criterion for him and so many today is not whether Catholicism is objectively true — whether Christ *was* and founded a Church; but whether it suits the needs of modern man. This is what counts for so many Protestants today. The appalling thing is that this is what is beginning to

count for far too many Catholics—not the ordinary Faithful, but the fringe types who achieve notoriety through their writing and talking; who do not know the ordinary Faithful, but think they do and whose writing can be pernicious in its effect on simple folk.

Holland and Germany are the source and centre of this subjectivism and one has only to look at the present caperings of the Dutch Church to see where a misguided and weak episcopate, strongly under subjective influence, is leading a once-good Catholic people. The Dutch, in my view and that of others, are as near a break from Rome now as any people can be. Subjectivism has shown itself amongst them not only doctrinally and liturgically — in their scandalous and persistent attempts to suit religion to their own caprice; but also in their attitude to papal authority, which is regarded as no more than a brake on personality. This is rationalistic subjectivism run wild. It must and can be halted only by total adherence to papal authority and objective truth.

Father O'Connell's booklet is of immense value, especially at this time. Since it was first published in the States, it has gone through five printings. It is very easy to read, everything is well explained. It is not at all a difficult book because everything in it is so clearly put. Moreover, at the end of each chapter there are questions and answers for discussion. The book could be of the greatest service to parish groups. I do not know whether it has yet been published in this country. It should have been by now; but it can easily be ordered from the States.

More easily available and of great importance is Bishop Philbin's pamphlet published by the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland and entitled, *Does Conscience Decide?* This is an excellent production and a great relief for anyone to read after having been submitted, after the publication of *Humanae Vitae*, to the trash written by so many self-appointed Catholic theologians about what they called conscience. The great merit of Bishop Philbin's pamphlet is that he shows very clearly what conscience is and what obligations it imposes on Catholics in the light of their

acceptance of Christ and his teaching. Norman St. John Stevas *et al.* — to say nothing of the members of one or two national hierarchies — are in for some nasty jolts if they condescend to read Bishop Philbin's forty-eight pages, as for one rather think they will not.

What Bishop Philbin has to say on this matter of conscience is what the Church has to say. Its essence is compressed within the following passage:

"The fundamentals of the position are two. The first is that no one can be expected to submit to external authority except by a free act based on personal conviction of the reliability of that authority. The second is that if Christ and His system are accepted with the complete submission He requires, all that is authenticated by Him must be received without question. In such circumstances, allowing one's personal judgement to be over-ruled by Him or His representative is not; it must be repeated, going against one's conscience; it is carrying out an obligation undertaken in the decision of faith; it is an exercise of conscience. It is not a breach of personal integrity, but a maintenance of the pledged integrity of faith."

These two first-class booklets, which I would consider essential reading for any Catholic at the present time, are well underpinned by a recent production of Christopher Derrick entitled, *Trimming the Ark*. Derrick writes with urbanity, knowledge and very great balance; his approach is splendidly objective. His sound suggestion throughout this good, sensible book is that there is a balance now to be redressed within the Church. The time has come to stress the perennial truths; the things that matter most, whether one's leaning be to "right" or "left" — if we have to use this appalling terminology to the Faith. (How like the Anglicans we are becoming these days, with their differences between "high" and "low" church, and so on.) More than anything else, exaggerated subjectives needs to be countered with a totally loving restatement of objective truth.

Paul Crane S.J.

Good and Bad

The Future of Christian Marriage; edited by John Marshall; Geoffrey Chapman, 25/-; pp 124.

This is a collection of essays in honour of Fr. Maurice O'Leary, and in recognition of his work on the Catholic Marriage Advisory Council. Its title, with the suggestion that Christian marriage is now going to be something new and strange, might upset Catholics who are weary of the "new theology" that attains novelty by abandoning tradition. Here and there, indeed, the book has touches of the naive assumption, which should by this time have disappeared, that true Christianity began with Pope John XXIII; but in the main it is a praiseworthy insistence on the personal dimensions of marriage. Patricia Marshall contributes a quiet and deeply spiritual chapter on "Married and Other Loves". Its insight into the richness and the interdependence of married and celibate love is inspiring. The editor of that excellent review, *Theology*, writes of mixed marriages with tolerance and compassion; but he understands the "non-infallibility" of *Humanae Vitae* and the freedom of conscience in ways which promise no solution of the problem. There are clear and competent essays on most of the other questions about marriage which arise in Christian minds.

Dr. John Marshall spends a paragraph demolishing a concept of "spiritual life" as though it implied the manichean and jansenist contempt for the body; but the ordinary meaning of "spiritual life" is the life of the Spirit which we have by being "born again of water and the Holy Ghost", and which transforms the whole person.

Any reader of the book whose suspicions were aroused by the title will have them fully confirmed by Dr. Dominician's chapter on "The Nature of Marriage". In the developing relationships of marriage, there should always

be, he says, "minimum degrees of fulfilment", the fruit one many suppose, of minimal requirements for entering the institution of marriage and meeting its demands. These "minimum degrees of fulfilment" should "evolve continuously, setting new standards in each successive age". The absence of these degrees of fulfilment at any stage "will invalidate the concept of marriage". The marriage ceremony therefore, has "to be examined afresh". It includes promises for the future of the relationship; but if the promises are not fulfilled in the "manifested relationship" the Church should have the ability to declare the marriage null and void.

So now we are to have a new diriment impediment; one moreover, which is not discernible at the moment of marriage but can manifest itself at any stage in the relationship. Every marriage is of its nature a trial marriage. Promises can be made; and if they are not kept they are to be counted not as broken but as not made at all. In the presence of "incompatibility", marriage vows are annulled and contracts are cancelled. On that non-principle, there can be no permanent states of life, married or celibate, no regard for people as responsible for their promises—and ultimately no social order.

And who will determine what degree of "incompatibility" amounts to a diriment impediment? "While the partners will assess their incompatibility the final judgement will be based on the exacting requirements of Christian marriage by a competent authority appointed by and in the name of the whole people of God". What! All five hundred millions of them?

How timely is Paul VI's recent statement that the more psychology and sociology we know, the better, but that psychology and sociology are not empowered to lay down the moral law!

William Lawson, S.J.